REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 14, 2004, having a shortened statutory period set to expire September 14, 2004. In the present Amendment, Claims 1-5, 7-9 and 12-14 are cancelled, Claims 6, 10-11 and 15 are amended, and Claims 16-17 are added. Claims 6, 10-11 and 15-17 are now pending.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

In Paragraph 1 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings for not specifically naming elements claimed in Claim 1. While the Applicants traverse these objections, Claim 1 has now been cancelled, and thus the objection is moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraph 3 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Bi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,262,719 – "*Bi*"). Although Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, the independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 on which this rejection is based have either been cancelled or amended to incorporate features of respective dependent Claims 9 and 14, thus making this rejection moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In paragraph 5 of the present Office Action, Claims 9-10 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bi*. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In the present Amendment, Claim 6 is amended to incorporate the features of Claim 9, from which Claim 10 depends. Likewise, Claim 11 is amended to incorporate the features of Claim 14, from which Claim 15 depends. Claims 16-17 are system claims claiming the features of Claims 6 and 10.

Bi describes a method and system for emulating a mouse with a touch-screen. Since it normally takes longer to double-touch a touch-screen with a pen that it takes to double-click a mouse, *Bi* teaches that "the host manager Windows module 1260 modifies the time and distance parameters to enable two pen-down events...to emulate a mouse double click" (*Bi*, col. 42, lines

41-49). However, there is no teaching or suggestion of a double-click input event that "is determined by double-click interval times that are different if the touch panel is double-clicked with a stylus pen or with a finger, and wherein the finger is recognized by having a larger contact area with the touch panel than the stylus pen." That is, if a finger is used, then the double-click time is different than if a pen is used, and the determination of whether a finger or pen is used is determined by the contact area accessed on the touch panel by either the pen or finger.

The Examiner never addresses the claimed feature of using the size of the contact area to determine whether a finger or pen, and thus different double-click times, is being used. If it is the Examiner's position that such a feature is "well known in the art" based on the Examiner's personal knowledge of such art, then per the requirements of the MPEP, Section 2144.03, Applicants respectfully request an affidavit with appropriate support describing such art.

CONCLUSION

As the prior art cited does not teach or suggest all of the features of the presently claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 50-0563.**

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Boice
Registration No. 44,545
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
P.O. Box 201720
Austin, Texas 78720-1720
(512) 343-6116
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Page 6
Docket No. JP9-2000-0443
Amend B